Monday, February 26 BRINE SHRIMP AND GROWING SEEDS Grades K-2

An introduction to two of the most successful units on living things which are in use in the Model Schools. Both are useful in the primary grades and Brine Shrimp can be used in a more intensive way in Grade 4. You will learn the techniques of culturing brine shrimp and will observe and learn more about these animals by watching them. Likewise, you will work intensively on the methods and ways of using Growing Seeds graphing.

Materials will be provided.

Instructors: Vivian Lightfoot, Flora Hill, Annie Neal
Workshop open to 30 teachers

Wednesday, February 28 SMALL THINGS (Advanced or Beginning) Grades 5-6

This workshop will prepare you to begin teaching Small Things and will provide assistance in advanced problems of the microscope, culturing protozoans or continuing with the study of pond and water life. (See March 27 workshop on Pond Water). Materials will be provided. When you sign up, indicate whether you're beginning or advanced.

Instructors: Ralph Jenkins and Flora Hill
Workshop open to 30 teachers

As the workshop program suggests, the Team focused on introducing new methods and new curriculum that emphasized the use of concrete learning materials and individualized and active learning experiences. Gordy's recollections express some of the tensions this Pilot Communities' approach imposed on the MSD teachers:

> The consultants did not simply bring "innovative", manipulative materials, but also a strange and different teaching style--a style which appeared permissive in nature and contradictory to the current of successful methods employed by these teachers. Many of us "urban teachers" had been led to believe that in order to survive, we had to have a disciplined class, operating according to strict rules. The proposed style required an individual to relinquish the role of the authority figure and to share the responsibility for learning with the student. This idea was quite frightening. Most humans find it difficult to alter behavior, particularly if the repercussions of the change are an unknown quantity.

The Innovation Team conducted 68 workshops during 1967-68, involving more than 2,000 teacher days in training. (Each MSD teacher was entitled to four full-day workshops.) About one-half of the sessions made use of outside consultants in association with Team members. Every teacher who attended a workshop was given the necessary materials to begin teaching or using the new methodologies. Approximately half of the sessions were related to reading and language arts. Some workshops were single, day-long interventions only; others were sequential and required attendance of the same teachers over a period of weeks.

In the spring of the first year, the Team arranged and secured support for two summer Institutes the largest of which was a Reading Institute for 65 K-3 teachers.

The second Summer Institute on the teaching of a social studies unit was organized and conducted by one member of the Innovation Team, in cooperation with the Smithsonian Institution and under a grant from the National Science Foundation.

Finally, the Team engaged in on-site curriculum development. One of the efforts was a booklet "Names You Hear in Cardozo," a biographical work on the Negroes for whom the schools in the Cardozo area were named. A second book, "Tell It Like It Is," was produced in response to the riots of April, 1968, following the assassination of Dr. Martin Luther King.

The publication of the children's book made the Team an "instant" success. A veritable deluge of demands suddenly descended upon it. Although greatly warmed by this response, the Team was initially unable to deal with the multitude of requests for its time and assistance. For a time,

things floundered as activities were overscheduled, under-organized, and no one had yet learned to say "no."

TEAM LEADER. During the Washington Team's second year, although activities continued much as they had before, more attention was focused on managing priorities. The second year was also marked by a significant shift in leadership from the white, outside consultant to a black teacher as elected Team leader. Ike Gordy, the new leader, attempted to re-organize the team. He, too, encountered numerous problems, all of which had to be worked out. He wrote, in retrospect:

> My initial operating style was one in which I was a nice guy, responding to the whims and/or concerns of every individual. Foremost in my mind was the fact that I must be "successful" and must be liked by my peers. I say peers because to be an elected leader means only that I am responsible for the coordination of the Team's activites, for chairing meetings, and for representing the group when necessary. This is in no way a promotion, nor does the appointment elevate me.
>
> My initial way to do what I knew I must do was to set up a pilot or steering committee to assist in the decision-making process. Prior to this, most of the decisions for the group were made by the Team on Fridays. A second task for this group of Task Force chairmen was to decide, by consensus, the agenda for Friday's meetings and, finally, to determine the order of priorities for the group. During this period, the overt concerns were again to develop group cohesion and remain at individual tasks, decided and controlled by the group. Many efforts were made by members of the Team to break from the group tasks and seek fulfillment from self-motivated projects.
>
> The efforts of these persons, who initiated their own projects, were stymied or halted by the Team. Questions such as, "Where are you going?" or "What are you doing?" were openly addressed to Team members. Later, I recognized these to really mean "How do your self-initiated tasks relate to the group tasks?" Very few, if any, Team members felt comfortable responding to these questions. Meetings in which members were confronted concerning their activity were very solemn and left me with a feeling of being completely drained. Many times I

wanted to answer or support an individual, but I was afraid that the interruption would halt the discussion. Team members viewed this as a laissez faire attitude and would try to capitalize on this by asking me to make announcements for them. Within, I tried to display a behavior which would foster and promote interactions. I felt that interactions and confrontations were healthy in that they reflected the kind of leadership and group atmosphere necessary for action-oriented programs, and provided a real experience for prospective leaders.

The Steering Committee idea seemed appropriate at that time. Tasks were given to volunteers and the committee gave the leader a direct line to the task groups. However, I did not have any way to hold individuals accountable for the tasks. If an individual neglected to do his task, the chairman had to rely on the group to take action. If no action was taken (this happened many times), the individual got away with doing nothing.

The basic program changes that occurred during the second year reflected the changing needs of the schools and the changing demands placed on the Team as a result of its experience and success. As Sherburne's history of 1968-69 indicates, its program focus included:

1. Expansion and follow-up in the teaching of Beginning Reading in the classrooms of teachers trained in the Summer Institute. This program involves extensive testing of children and a series of workshops for teachers on how to give and make use of information derived from tests. The tests being used are a battery of new ones designed especially for inner city, urban cultures.

   Also a grant from the Polaroid Corporation has made it possible to emphasize the development of language skills through the production of children-made, illustrated, and written books.

   A second grant from a private foundation has made it possible to extend to the upper grades the program of having children write their own books.

2. Extension of staff development programs to the administrative level in the Model School Division. . . This was begun during the current year with a two-day weekend

conference on human relations in which principals, administrators, and Innovation Team members of all the schools in the Model School Division participated.

3. Dissemination and extension of the ideas of the Model School Division to other school systems and schools within the D. C. system. A large part of the time of the Team is currently being spent in telling others about its work, how it functions, and the programs in use. Team members have participated in national meetings all over the country, have served in advisory capacities to departments and programs within the school system, and have talked to numerous local and civic groups.

4. Expansion of the Team's workshop operation in the area of reading. It continues to support teachers with workshops in mathematics, science, and social studies. Special development programs are also in operation in a half-dozen classrooms in music and drama. In social studies, two workshops have already been conducted for teachers on the subject.

LONG TERM INFLUENCE. The Team has continually had to face some questions about the larger issues of change. How could the power and effectiveness of the Team become transferred to principals and teachers in such a way that the Team did not always have to maintain the load of an accelerating demand? How could the findings be disseminated to the larger system? Would they work in other areas of the city? In March, 1970, the Team made its first move outside the MSD to the Georgetown area where three troubled schools sought assistance. The combination of Team skills in human relations, problem diagnosis, and curriculum expertise were useful there. During the summer of 1970, the Team undertook the largest operation of Summer Institutes it had ever taken, reaching large numbers of teachers outside the Model School Division and up into the junior high level. The Team extended its expertise through differentiated institutes: an Open Classroom Workshop; a Man-A Course of Study Workshop; a Reading Institute; a Mathematics and Science Institute.

The 1970-71 school year posed the greatest challenge to the Team's educational values. The school system adopted a plan for encouraging academic achievement in a way that went counter to the Team's mode of operations. The Team's central belief that change should be generated and planned by those who have to carry it out was not supported by the Board of Education when it adopted the Clark proposal for a system-wide reading plan. Similarly, the Team's belief that there should be differential solutions to instructional problems was not upheld by the unitary proposal on reading. How the Team could continue to function in a helping and innovative role, and yet pursue the stated goals of the system became a crucial issue.

The Team met the problem creatively, using the resiliency of its members to respond in planning and problem diagnosis. It refused to politicize its informal power but used its human and physical resources to help principals and teachers, to the best of their ability, to respond to the system-wide reading plan. The Team conducted workshops for principals, trained teachers for reading, and assisted the superintendent in a planning and organization effort.

EXIT. In 1970, individual Team members became involved in the formation of new groups that could expand the Innovation Team philosophy throughout the city. One Team member is now the developer and leader of a Team and a teaching center being organized in the Model Cities area of Washington. A second Team member is organizing an advisory service in open education to connect public and private school teachers, parents, and administrators interested in experimenting with alternatives in education. (The connecting link between the people in this group will be their philosophical commitment

to experiments in open education.) A third Team member desires to create an experimental school which will explore new ways of management and organization of a single school. A fourth Team member is the director of a project in the Baltimore City area that offers an innovation team and learning resource center for teachers in the Model Cities target schools. Other Team members have produced plans for expanding the present Team operation and Resource Center to serve the training purposes of the larger D. C. school system.

OPERATING PRINCIPLES (V)

The following lessons from the Pilot Communities' experience concern the tenuous balance between too much team initiative and too little.

Operating Principle

INTERACTION WITH THE CLIENT SYSTEM. Team members must walk a difficult path, midway between evaluation and passive service. On the one hand, they must never take part in the system's evaluation of its teachers; on the other hand, they must be able to state clearly their own educational beliefs and biases and must not shrink from critical interaction with teachers.

Evidence from the Four Sites

In terms of identifying their educational beliefs, the Team members in the Pilot Communities Program were aided by their relationships with EDC. By 1967, teachers had a general knowledge of the learning principles EDC espoused. Many Team members, from the beginning, and increasingly so over the years, were open education advocates. They sought to encourage increased openness, student-initiated learning, and individualization in the classroom. Only the Boston Team had a sizeable minority of members who were frankly skeptical about the efficacy of open education for urban children.

Teachers at the four sites entered into relationships with the Teams, more or less expecting the Team members to offer curriculum wares that would embody these discovery principles. However, they were

soon to find that EDC had done little work in some curricular areas, and they often resented the slowness of the development process, a difficulty compounded by poor organization at EDC-Newton for the delivery of curricular aid to the Teams.

But, even when they could not or would not provide handy curriculum packages, the Team members were often invaluable to new and old classroom teachers. They were in touch with new ideas and procedures; they had the time to hang around and help. And, most important, their opinions about an individual teacher's performance would not "leak" back into the evaluation networks of the system. Although they never passed on evaluative information gathered from their classroom visits, the Team members were not simply passive, non-directive visitors. They were not ashamed of their pedagogical biases, and they did not shrink from private praise of teachers or disagreement with them. In addition, they had to be able to demonstrate their own beliefs. Eloquent theoreticians who are scared of children are out of place on Innovation Teams, and so are "natural teachers" who cannot or will not articulate their good practice. A continuing complaint of teachers during the first two years in Maine was that some Maine Team members refused to reveal their educational beliefs. Teachers came to believe that they had a "hidden agenda."

Operating Principle

RELATIONSHIP-BUILDING WITH INDIVIDUAL TEACHERS. This process builds on the whole-Team contracting process, and

is analagous to it. Team members should go only where they are wanted. They should respond to specific needs, and build relationships with individual teachers in an atmosphere of mutual respect and learning. If they become passive deliverymen or zealots for single solutions, their effectiveness is lost.

Evidence from the Four Sites

Once the initial contract was made between the Team and several schools, Team members ran workshops, institutes, conferences, and lecture series, but attendance was never compulsory. They carefully followed-up teachers who attended their group activities, but never trespassed where they were not wanted; they only visited the classrooms of those teachers who invited them in.

On the other hand, they made every attempt to be wanted. They were willing to gradually soften-up resistant teachers by dropping by when their classes were not in session and by using other teachers to encourage their friends to cooperate. Cooperating teachers often received curriculum materials without the delay usual in many school systems; the Washington Team set up a quick delivery system. (Their popularity as deliverymen of materials made some Team members uneasy, but they soon realized that service was desperately needed, and that it helped gain them entry for work they considered more important.) Team members had other tangible goods to encourage cooperation; classroom help in teaching, discipline, and organization; released time and

substitutes when teachers wanted to attend workshops as well as in-service credits, and (often) extra pay for attending Team-sponsored activities. The Boston Team in its last year of operation devoted much energy to an in-school Resource Center for children and teachers. In short, the Teams actively enticed teachers into their orbit.

The tension between being "experts" or "process consultants" remained in the foreground in the operations of all the Teams. Teachers welcomed the expeditious delivery of new bits of curriculum like the E.S.S. kits. They eagerly sought specific ideas and were wary when Team members pressed them to take time to ponder the larger implications of their adoption of these ideas.

Successful Team members saw themselves as "consultants", not "experts". As one Maine Team member said, "I see a consultant as someone who can help facilitate the process of people helping themselves. A consultant, for example, can help you work out the process by which you can meet your own needs. An expert, on the other hand, would make specific suggestions as to the kinds of programs, materials, or procedures you might follow."

The four Teams often made use of "experts", especially in short-term workshops and teachers' institutes. There was ample recognition of the useful role people with very specialized skills can perform. Many Team members had special talents.

Dr. Curtis' considerable expertise in reading programs exemplifies this. The "consultant" mode described above was clearly the preferred role. "Consultants," in this sense, seem to come closer to the Leistershire idea of "advisors." They come in only on teachers' requests, armed with solid classroom experience and teaching skill. They are not judgmental, they are not afraid to articulate their own values and demonstrate them with a class. As a Bridgeport Team member said, "We are outside people helping to release insiders' energies." The successful Team members seem to have many of the helping qualities of the best teachers in open classrooms. This analogy might be a helpful one for selection and training purposes.

CHAPTER 5

BOSTON, BRIDGEPORT, WASHINGTON AND MAINE--A COMMON EVOLUTION

The four teams, in their separate sites, never worked together which probably accounted in part for the extreme differences in their development. Seen from another perspective, however, all four teams underwent a general evolution that makes them look very much alike.

For the first year-and-a-half the teams seldom dealt with parents or "community," and they communicated only very infrequently with the other adults (employers, ministers, or social workers, for example) who are part of the total educational process of children.

Furthermore, the Teams' whole attention in the early stage was devoted to the dissemination and development of curricula for classroom use, usually in those areas in which EDC had been specializing as a curriculum development organization. Most of the initial Team members at all four sites were "master teachers" with considerable classroom experience. Many had been involved with EDC's curriculum development "shops."

Much of this teacher-to-teacher activity was exceedingly slow and frustrating. Some Team members had little to offer teachers; many teachers and administrators were incurably suspicious of outsiders. All of the Teams experienced great difficulty working with EDC. The original hope that the Teams would purvey new and exciting EDC curriculum materials to urban and rural schools often foundered because the EDC curriculum development shops seemed to have little interest in bending their work schedules to fit the needs discovered by the Teams in the field. And many of the needs, like reading,

bilingual education, and black identity curriculum were not areas of interest for the various EDC shops.

At the end of the first two years, money for the Program became tighter. The Office of Education began to cut funds, insisting on more concentration of resources and more centralized evaluation and training functions in Newton. Because of these and other difficulties with the original model of teacher-to-teacher help and because of the reduced resources, the Maine and Bridgeport Teams stopped working with experienced teachers in classrooms. The Maine Team shifted its efforts completely into pre-service education, supported partially by EDC, but with most of its funding from other Federal sources. Its program with teacher-trainees is exciting, but it has very little in common with the original Innovation Team notion that we have focused on in this document.

The Bridgeport Team was disbanded after the second year. It had foundered from the beginning. One Team member continued to help teachers with math curricula in the new middle schools, but here was a solo venture. Other EDC personnel developed a very successful teacher-aide training program at East Side Middle School, and tried unsuccessfully to help the Bridgeport schools initiate a Model School Division like Washington's. These were, however, isolated projects, not a concentrated Team effort to help classroom teachers with curriculum revision and development.

After the original activities of the Maine and Bridgeport Teams were halted in 1969, most of the available resources of the Pilot Communities Programs were split between central administration, training, and evaluation at EDC-Newton, and the two remaining field Teams in Boston and Washington.

This is not to say that the 1969-1971 work in Bridgeport and Maine was insignificant. But, by 1969, work at those sites had moved far away from the original Innovation Team concept.

If we concentrate on the first two years in Bridgeport and Maine and the four years in Washington and Boston, we can begin to see an important change in the original concept of an Innovation Team, a change we have indicated in the Bridgeport and Maine narratives. Over the four years of the program, Team members gradually saw themselves less and less as "master teachers" and more and more as "change agents." This shift signifies far more than a mere change in nomenclature might indicate. The very notion of "master teacher" carried with it a connotation of expertness that individual Team members found both inaccurate and inappropriate. From the beginning, their goal was to encourage teachers to work out their own curriculum and changes in classroom organization, not to serve teachers as instant "experts" in new curricula. They also disliked being deliverymen, mere conduits of "the latest and the best" in curriculum innovations. They wanted to help teachers discover their own resources, just as they encouraged teachers to help the children in their classrooms discover their own resources. As experienced teachers themselves, the Team members had seen first-hand the short life of "teacher-proof" curriculum packages handed over to teachers who adopted them wholesale, with little or no thought about their relation to individual children's needs.

Furthermore, the Team members began to see the critical necessity of work outside the classroom that could reinforce their work with individual teachers. From the beginning, all the Teams had relied on workshops and institutes to unfreeze groups of teachers and to encourage them to

communicate with each other, instead of hiding behind closed classroom doors. Gradually, they began adding workshops for parents, hoping to help the parents understand the changes that teachers were trying to accomplish. In Washington, parent workshops, organized ostensibly to teach parents how to help their children with homework, turned into fundamental math and language literacy sessions when parents admitted their own basic educational needs. The Boston Team added members whose principal responsibility was the organization of Dearborn School parents.

The Teams also increasingly worked with school administrators. The Washington Team gradually had a significant change of heart about working with principals and other supervisors. Initially, the Team members had gone directly to classroom teachers, bypassing building principals. In the fourth year, they were heavily engaged with principals, not only in the buildings where they worked with teachers, but throughout the system.

In addition, the Teams came in contact with other educational institutions and reform groups in their communities. The Maine Team spent more and more time, even in its second year, with local universities and colleges and the State Department of Education. From the beginning, the Boston Team was heavily engaged with private community schools in Roxbury, Boston State--the largest teacher-training institution for Boston schools--and literally dozens of agencies and groups trying to improve Boston schools. The Boston Team trained adults as classroom aides and organized parents, and, for four years, operated a community resource center. Work with non-classroom educators, especially supervisors and teacher-trainers increased the Teams' impact on formal instruction, and helped to prepare

the way for policy changes that might permanently implement some of the helping work of the Teams.

Although the organizational mode of each site was different, in the first year of operation approximately two-thirds of the total resources of the Pilot Communities Program was spent on Team members who were to act as master teachers. By 1971, however, the proportions had reversed; less than one-third of the Program's resources were spent on master teachers. Funds spent at Newton for training, documentation, evaluation, and administration absorbed more than half of the Program's resources. The Maine Team had left classroom materials and master teachers completely for an emphasis on effective pre-service teacher education; and in Boston only $60,000 out of a total estimated budget of $141, 000 was directly committed to "classroom support." These proportions may be inexact, but they indicate the shift away from the initial emphasis on master teachers and new curriculum materials towards a view of educational change that included many other components. By 1971, only the Washington Team remained heavily committed to the initial notion that an Innovation Team would consist principally of master teachers working with experienced classroom teachers on curriculum improvement. And even the Washington Team members had extended the concept of master teachers far beyond its 1967 definition.

At the end of four years, then, the Teams were composed of "change agents" who had developed skills that extended far beyond the original conception of their roles as master teachers. In the words of one Team member, change agents were not so much "to teach, to demonstrate, or to do" as to "work intensively with training and generating, in other people, behaviors that can bring about change." In the process some of the Teams laid aside

or periodically neglected the original mission of the Innovation Teams. But through their own organic development, they demonstrated graphically that change in classrooms cannot be dealt with as an isolatable phenomenon.

One final question about the common experience of the four Teams remains to be asked--but unfortunately cannot be answered: How did the four Teams go about withdrawing or exiting from the host system?

The whole issue of exit--or orderly departure of an Innovation Team--was never squarely faced in the Pilot Communities Program. The reports of the Program frequently characterized the Teams as "temporary systems," as task groups that would go out of existence once their task was performed. But the tasks proliferated; there was always a new project to undertake. The Teams in Bridgeport and Maine left their original tasks, not primarily because they had finished them, but because Pilot Communities funds were cut back and were concentrated on the Boston and Washington Teams. When the Office of Education announced in the fall of 1970 that the 1970-71 school year would be the last year of the program, the remaining Teams were caught off-guard, without plans for orderly disengagement. The Boston Team, in fact, was beginning anew with a new leader. The Washington Team had elaborate expansion plans, not plans to contract.

The Pilot Communities experience gives little evidence of successful exit; therefore, we cannot presume to construct an "operating principle" about the process, but we can at least attempt to make some common sense observations. A Team should not, it seems to us, simply fizzle out without working with the

system to plan and fund the next steps and the long-term strategies for continuing change once the Team has left. A Team should plan for an orderly departure well in advance of the moment of termination. Hopefully, careful planning, assessment, and modification will be activities built into the on-going process of the Team. However, a final assessment is particularly important. An Innovation Team should not exit quietly, but with very definite events to delineate its termination. These events should encourage reflection on the Resource Team venture by Team members, teachers, students, administrators, and parents. This will be an important learning experience for continuing efforts at improvement and will encourage all participants in the system to assume some responsibility toward this end.

CHAPTER 6

THE POSSIBILITIES AND LIMITATIONS OF INNOVATION TEAMS

The planners of the Pilot Communities Program and the Team members who implemented it were principally absorbed in doing their innovation work. When they were reflective, they tended to be concerned with immediate problems, with daily decisions, and not with questions that related to two or three, or five years hence. Just as they avoided thinking about exit--their immediate future--they never faced adequately the longer, larger implications of their work.

This lack of critical reflection on what the Teams were doing, why they were doing it, and what they hoped to accomplish, seriously affected the functioning and final outcome of Team efforts. Problems which hampered or, in some cases, paralyzed the Teams, could have been anticipated, dealt with more effectively, or perhaps even avoided. Time might have been used more wisely if the Teams had had a clearer sense of short- and long-term goals.

For those communities who are considering instituting Innovation Teams, we would like to highlight several issues essential to the success of such a project.

Support for the Innovation Team. The planners of an Innovation Team project should consider, from the very beginning, whether the system will be able to support the project and the changes it generates in the long run. "Support" is used here in three senses--ideological, fiscal, and

structural. Innovation Teams represent a particular kind of educational innovation: the development of a cadre of "helping" teachers, released from classroom duties, and with a mandate to improve instruction by working closely with teachers who invite their help. Until a system is willing to consider seriously the long-term costs and implications of such differentiated staffing, it should not start down the Innovation Team road.

Some personnel in the school systems will be unable to support the consequences of such an innovation ideologically. Building principals or supervisors, for example, may be threatened by a Team if its members encourage teachers to think of new ways of grouping children or of changing the learning situation to encourage more student initiative. The Washington Team approached this problem circuitously, first avoiding principals, but eventually involving them in workshops deliberately designed to introduce them to some of the new practices it was espousing. In the long run, a Team cannot simply avoid such opposition; it will have to find ways to change supervisors' attitudes and behaviors, if the teachers' changes are to endure.

Parents may also be wary of changes. The efforts of the Maine Team at one school foundered, because parents felt that changes were coming too quickly and breaking too sharply with established practice. Urban parents are especially likely to be suspicious of "open education" practices; they often feel that order and discipline are synonymous with learning, and that a shift to more student-initiated learning may impede their children's

chances of conventional academic success. In Boston, the Team found it necessary to devote much time to parent education and organization.

The teachers to be helped by the Team will provide the swing vote on the ideological side. If teachers want change and the extra responsibilities that a Team can help them develop, their enthusiasm and advocacy will make the difference. Whether or not a Team likes to think in political terms, its efforts with teachers will be a form of teacher organizing. A Team will be successful if it can bring teachers, supervisors, and parents to see that learning conditions can be improved and to insist on continued improvement once the Team has been disbanded. A major test of such success will be the institution of teacher-helping mechanisms in the system: system-sponsored resource teachers, as well as principals who take the role of instructional leadership seriously. Of the four "Pilot Communities," only Washington has begun to institute these changes.

In the long run, support for the kind of change that an Innovation Team will initiate will also demand structural changes. Status hierarchy, power relations, and role definitions create vested interests, procedures, and formal and informal rules that encourage behavior contradictory to attitudes of openness, collaboration, and experimentation. These structural relationships will have to be changed if new attitudes are to be given a chance to survive. Innovations in a classroom will not last long if teachers are not supported in their experimenting, or if the norms are such that teachers can only maintain a sense of security by emphasizing discipline and achievement tests as indications of their success.

There will be some school systems that are so wedded to their structure that the very notion of an Innovation Team would be ludicrous. We suspect that Boston may be such a system; the Boston Team certainly had very little impact on the system per se, although it was helpful to children and some individual teachers. In some cities, people who want to change the schools may have to turn, not to the evolutionary internal kinds of change exemplified by an Innovation Team, but to the more dramatic kinds of change that the cries for "community control" indicate.

The question of long-term fiscal support is also important. Releasing teachers from classroom duties to help other teachers is expensive as a small-scale experiment and even more costly in the long run. If a school system should undertake to experiment with an Innovation Team, it would have to be willing to release at least half-a-dozen teachers and to provide them with funds to purchase materials and training. There would also have to be access to groups of teachers through summer or weekend workshops, and these teachers would have to be paid for their extra time. Such a scale of effort would cost at least $100,000 a year. Over the long run, it would cost much more to provide Teams of resource teachers for every school in the system.

All the Teams in the Pilot Communities Program had these funds and this access to teachers. They could provide consultants, take teachers on trips, and deliver new materials rapidly, without the interminable delays endemic in most school systems; moreover, the Pilot Communities Program was federally-sponsored, and it was initiated when money

for this sort of experimentation was readily available. No one involved with the Pilot Communities Program ever alleged that it was inexpensive, nor were there discernible efforts to make it more cost-effective.

It may well be that future Teams established by school systems will be at an advantage if they are funded from the beginning with school systems' funds. Virtually none of the funds for the Pilot Communities Teams came from the regular budget of the host school systems. This fiscal fact may have helped the Teams to feel more freedom, but it reinforced their "outsideness." The school systems had very little economic stake in the success of the Teams. Only in Washington was the funding sufficiently "local" (reinforcing the indigenous origins of most of the Washington Team members) to force the school system to take the Team seriously. The Washington Team had a better chance of surviving, because its members were on the system's payroll from the very beginning. D. C. "owned" its Team while the other Pilot Communities invested little or nothing in their Teams.

In the long run, a Team must prove its usefulness, or it will die. But local investment in it, <u>from the beginning,</u> should improve its chances of success.

<u>Expansion of the Program.</u> From the beginning, an Innovation Team will need a long-term strategy that will enable it to spread its effect to the whole school system. Most Teams will start with parts of the system, with individual schools as the Maine and Bridgeport Teams did, or with a sub-system like Washington's Model School Division.

The Pilot Communities Program may have been too optimistic about pervading the systems in which it worked with the changes generated by an Innovation Team. The assumption seemed to be that the process of expanding the use of Resource Teams to other schools would be automatic, that adoption would occur in the natural course of events. However, on the surface, at least, three of the systems "cooled out" the idea. Bridgeport has some new curricula for its schools and an active teacher aide program. There are fifty unusually trained new teachers in the Maine schools. Boston has a bilingual cluster program and a new and vibrant private community school. Some experienced teachers at all four program sites have developed new ways to individualize instruction and encourage student-initiated learning, but as of this date, none of the "Pilot Communities" has adopted the Innovation or Resource Team notion. We already know the fate of the Innovation Team notion in Maine and Bridgeport, and it seems highly unlikely that the Boston Public Schools will either find a way to continue the Resource Team there or start another.

Only the Washington Team seems to have dealt successfully with the termination of Pilot Communities funding. The second Washington Team leader has moved on to start an Innovation Team in Baltimore, funded by Baltimore's Model Cities Program. Other Team members in Washington are continuing the work of the Team in various forms; the Team seems to have established the notion of teachers helping teachers in the D.C. Schools. In Washington, therefore, the system's apparent failure to adopt the Innovation Team idea may be insignificant compared to some of the other changes the Washington Team has helped generate.

Unless new Teams are more attentive to pervading the larger system than most of the Pilot Communities Teams were, they will run the risk of devoting all of their energies to the work immediately at hand, thus not being able to reach outward--to other teachers and to other schools.

One strategy that should enhance the possibilities of wider-scale impact would be to rotate Team membership. Team members could be assigned to the Team for two or three years, with the clear expectation that they would return to their "home schools" after learning how to work with teachers. The planners could build in the expectation that teachers rotated out of the Team would be allowed to carry out teacher-helping activities when they leave the Team.

Another long-run strategy might be to insist on the adoption of a plan that would promise the continued expansion of teacher-helping Teams to the rest of the system after an initial trial period. The original Team's efforts could be scrutinized by an independent observer who would evaluate its efficacy and allow expansion after initial performance criteria are met. Such an evaluation would have to use performance criteria consistent with the objectives of the Team.

Limitations of the Resource Team Strategy. Innovation Teams, as they were established and developed by the Pilot Communities Program, spring from a basic assumption that public schools can be improved in an evolutionary manner. The kinds of changes instituted by the Pilot Communities Program were more incremental than the sweeping reforms proposed by advocates of decentralization and community control, such as abolishing

compulsory schooling. One suspects that the latter kinds of intervention should produce much more radical change, but that is only a suspicion.

There is no evidence presently available that will prove or disprove the efficacy of the Pilot Communities Program in itself, or in comparison to other, more radical alternatives. It is for this reason that in this document we have attempted to describe the Program, not to evaluate it, and to accept it for what it was intended to be, not for what it might have been if other people had set it up or funded it. Our intention is to help the next community set up such an Innovation Team by avoiding some of the mistakes and paying attention to some of the successes of four such Teams over four years of experimentation. The interested community must be made aware of the inherent limitations of an Innovation Team approach to the improvement of education.

The notion of Innovation or Resource Teams was a major step forward from the school curriculum reforms of the 60's. Helping a teacher on all classroom activities--from curriculum to discipline to organization--is potentially far more efficacious than plugging in a new science series here or a language lab there. The range of help by the Pilot Communities Teams still tended to be too narrow, focusing rather on some of the cognitive curricula--especially science and mathematics--and often neglecting the humanities and social sciences, as well as usually disregarding "affective" curricula.

In addition, the Teams tended to work with isolated classroom teachers, and too seldom worked on the whole professional atmosphere of any school.

Only rarely is there anything like a community of interested professionals in a specific school. Only a very few schools have interesting, expanding talk in teachers' lounges, useful faculty meetings, cross-visitation of classes by teachers, and other forums for exchange of ideas. Good teachers exist in every system, but they are almost always very isolated from each other. Seldom do they share ideas; seldom do they talk in any depth about individual students.

The Pilot Communities' ideology towards teachers fully respected individual differences between them and tended to be relatively less concerned with the climate of the school as a whole. The individual elementary classroom--however "open" or "closed" it may be--was usually still age-graded and isolated. And the individual teacher was primarily dealt with as an individual teacher, not as a member of a faculty, not as a teacher's union member concerned with whole-system politics.

In addition, the classroom-centered ideology of the Pilot Communities Program seems to have been too little concerned with school administrative officers to expect deep-seated changes. For example, Pilot Communities Teams could have put much more money into intensive workshops for principals and supervisors. Instead, most of the resources went to individual classroom teachers. There seems to have been a general feeling that top-level liaison was needed: the superintendent of schools needed to be courted, but there was too little middle-level liaison; Bridgeport is the principal example of that failure.

Finally, there was very little attention paid to education outside school, e.g., from families to church groups to the streets. There have been neither street workers, nor social workers, nor any family visitors on the Teams outside Boston. The whole Program was directed at working with classroom teachers in (mostly) public schools, and there seems to have been relatively little attention paid to in-home teaching, work with gangs, or concentrated educational experiences such as camps or boarding schools. The Teams did step outside the patterns of conventional, formal schooling, often with great success, as in the aide-training program in Bridgeport. They were constrained by their funding source: the Office of Education was primarily interested in the improvement of deliberate, in-school instruction; however, the Teams seem to have needed more thorough discussion of alternative modes of change.

Alternative Strategies. If there is sufficient dissatisfaction among relevant constituencies and sufficient support from the administrative hierarchy, then an Innovation Team-type strategy can be useful for a number of purposes, so long as the obvious mistakes made by the Pilot Communities are avoided. Although the Resource Team was originally conceived as a strategy for achieving a particular objective, it was practiced in the Pilot Communities as a type of intervention which, in fact, could be used for several purposes and not just delivery of new curricula.

If a school system is at a fairly low level of readiness for change, then the Team is a non-threatening means for increasing this readiness, by getting teachers accustomed to trying out new ideas and by discussing problems in the classroom--reflecting on educational goals--on a

one-to-one supportive basis. The goal of introducing new curriculum becomes quite secondary to the idea of increasing teachers' awareness of their role as teachers. The Team can be opportunistic, using any chance to respond to teachers' needs as a way of gaining trust and respect. This develops in teachers an excitement about teaching, a sense of security in trying new methods, and a sense of confidence that they might be able to influence and make needed changes in conditions around them.

It is possible that the state of a system may be such that the primary focus of a Team should be on delivery of new curriculum methods. In this case, the system should be made aware that the presence of a Team for a limited amount of time is not sufficient for any meaningful and permanent change to occur. The Team should encourage the school to consider alternative ways in which this delivery can continue in financially feasible terms; for instance, a) making sure that materials, newsletters, etc. are received from curriculum development centers; b) cutting back the number, but still keeping master teachers as a permanent part of the system; c) giving teachers release time either for independent work or group seminars and discussions. This can be arranged by planning independent work for students (probably good only for upper grades; younger kids still need supervision) or bringing in volunteer teacher aides and scheduling outside people to give a class on a topic of their expertise; or d) creating team structures of teachers, students, and administrators, both temporary and permanent, so that the benefits of a Team vs. a hierarchy can be permanently institutionalized, and teachers can develop their own innovations (as opposed to adoption or adaptation of innovations developed externally).

There are, of course, pros and cons to each of the above suggestions; consequently, we come to the purpose of a Resource Team, namely as a "change agent" for organizational development, engaging all members of the school in a self-study, with the idea of creating an environment for change. This method incorporates basic organizational principles: that those who must ultimately carry out the changes must be a part of planning them and that change must start with the actors' perception of the problems, etc. Other strategies can incorporate these principles too, but the organizational development approach makes them fundamental. This focus demands a different kind of Team, one in which the personal, interpersonal, sensitivity, and leadership-building skills are most important. Expertise in a subject matter may not be as necessary as is experience in school systems--important for trust and accuracy in the change agent's perceptions.

The Pilot Communities followed at least one principle enunciated by theorists of organizational development in identifying and energizing local strengths. Time after time, Team members moved into a situation, identified local leadership, helped that leadership get some skills--or money, or ideas--and got out of the way. This happened at every level--in classrooms, in school buildings, in pre-school centers--and was often more useful than trying to stay within the original focus of working with individual teachers. Thus, the mottos change. At first, it was: "Listen carefully; make sure you know every step." By the end, the slogan is: "Get out of the way."

A second category of change strategies becor propriate when preconditions for a Resource Team are not met, when dissatisfaction is not widespread, and/or support does not exist from the hierarchy. A number of possibilities exist: 1) Attempt to enter a school at a very specific, service-oriented level. (The personal friendships established may be used as a vehicle for encouraging participation in workshops and finding the sources of resistance to change.) 2) Set up an alternative school. 3) Organize students, teachers, or parents to be effective interest groups, applying political pressure on the system, so that is is within the self-interest of the system to respond.

The above discussion of change strategies in schools is predicated on the assumption that ultimately the most important and necessary change in schools is that they become capable of creatively adapting to internal and external pressures; that a structure and culture is created which encourages each member's curiosity to learn and gain respect for himself and others; and supports experimentation and risk-taking. All other changes will otherwise have a limited effect and will be less than satisfactory. We believe that the usefulness and outcomes of Innovation Team activity--both within the Pilot Communities and in those started independently in other communities--must ultimately be judged with this perspective.